

University of Dayton
eCommons

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

10-11-2011

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2011-10-11

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2011-10-11" (2011). *All Committee Minutes*. 51.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/51

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes

October 11, 2011, 3:00 pm

St. Mary's 113B

Present: Partha Banerjee, Corinne Daprano, Pat Donnelly (ex-officio), Linda Hartley (chair), Emily Hicks, Sheila Hughes, Caroline Merithew, Andrea Seielstad, Kim Trick, Paul Vanderburgh, Rebecca Wells
Absent: Art Jipson, Dave Johnson, Kevin Kelly, Kaitlin Regan

1. Approval of Minutes of September 27, 2011
Minutes Approved
2. Faculty Workload ad hoc committee report – Dr. Vanderburgh
This committee has had their first meeting and plan to meet approximately every two weeks.

Committee Charge:

- Look at university guidelines of faculty workload and revisit Senate Document 95-01
 - Review existing policy and adherence to this policy
 - Conduct background research
 - Make a list of recommendations by January 16, 2012
3. Intellectual Property Policy Proposal (Doc-11-XX) – Dr. Wells

Current policy (approved in 1994) does not provide specific guidelines for ownership of online courses. Dr. Wells' committee proposal includes online courses be dealt with in the very same way as traditional courses by recommending that an addendum be added to the current policy which treats online courses as traditional courses. (With a written agreement before the work for the online course is completed.)

Discussion:

Some FAC members suggested that the proposed addendum be added to the body of the current policy and that this document be reviewed after the addendum was approved. It was also agreed by those FAC members in attendance at today's meeting that the Senate should conduct a full review of this policy (including any ownership issues or challenges regarding application of online courses) no later than 2014.

The FAC further proposed that there needed to be both a review of the entire Intellectual Property policy as well as the online addendum to that policy.

Question was raised in discussion about why this addendum is not being called a revision. And it was again brought up that the addendum be added to the current Intellectual Property policy document rather than constructed as a tag-along.

Specific suggestions were discussed regarding where the addendum would be embedded. Two options were discussed: (1) that the addendum be inserted at Section 3.3.1.1 (specifically between the 2nd and 3rd par. of current doc, making the addendum

now 3rd par.); or (2) that the addendum be added to the 2nd paragraph itself which starts with “Textbooks, manuals, or training...”

This discussion of placement elicited more discussion dealing with what the default policy really was: Is it that a faculty develops an online course, and it resides on Isidore, faculty may take it with them (if s/he leaves the university) and that UD may also use that course? Or is it that unless faculty invokes the significant use policy, the course belongs to UD?

There was further discussion about the difference between developing a course and developing material in conjunction with a course.

Given the discussion, Dr. Wells agreed to revise the proposal and that it would be emailed to FAC members prior to our next meeting for discussion and approval.

4. Student Observation of Faculty Teaching Proposal (Revisions)

The Senate proposal (SOFT) was given to ECAS on September 28. ECAS reviewed and discussed the document at their October 6 meeting. Several suggested revisions were articulated in a memo from President Jon Hess, with the majority of suggestions requesting clarity in the document.

Discussion:

It was first suggested that given ECAS’ suggestions and its request for further clarification, that the ad hoc committee should come together and revise their document for a further pass through ECAS.

But after further discussion of the original ECAS charge and details about how FAC received the work (specifically that the APC had originally worked on the issue) it was agreed that it would be more efficient for Dr. Hartley and Dr. Hughes to revise the document rather than reconvene the ad hoc committee. The revision will be emailed to FAC and will be discussed at the October 25 meeting.

5. Faculty and Instructional Staff/Title Revision Proposal – Dr. Donnelly

Continued discussion of the revised proposal.

Emeritus status discussed – the idea behind the revisions was that there be a more uniform process of designating emeritus status and that the decision should come from more than just a department chair making the recommendation to his/her unit. It was clear to the committee that there needed to be more consistency throughout the university and one way to get that is to work with the committee structure that exists. Because P and T committees are now mandated and exist in every unit, these seemed natural places for emeritus decisions to be made.

There was discussion about the relationship between emeritus status and promotion and it was suggested that there be a committee which reviews the purpose and

philosophy behind emeritus status as well as the criteria for the designation. That is, the revision to the process – which this document does – may not be enough.

There was more discussion about the document's language regarding longevity. Dr. Donnelly agreed that the word "meritorious" would be a good term to add to help committees make emeritus status decisions.

Even with this change the issue of process was still unclear.

It was decided to continue the discussion and to review the document further next FAC meeting. Dr. Donnelly requested committee members to send suggestions to him via email.

Next FAC meeting: October 25, 2011, 3 pm, KU 207.

Minutes submitted by Caroline Merithew.